Cas	e 3:11-cv-02910-MMA-MDD	Document 5	Filed 01/10/12	PageID.45	Page 1 of 2
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	BOTTLEHOOD, INC.,		CASI	E NO. 11cv29	10 MMA (MDD)
12		Plaintif	f, ORD	ER DENYINC	G EX PARTE
13	VS.			ION TO EXPI OVERY	EDITE
14	THE BOTTLE MILL, et al.,		[DOC	C. NO. 4]	
15		Defendants	S.		
16	Before the Court is Plaintiff's <i>ex parte</i> motion to expedite discovery filed on January 6, 2012. (Doc. No. 4). Plaintiff filed its complaint on December 14, 2011, against Defendant The				
17					
18					
19	Bottle Mill, its two general partners and John Does 1 through 25. (Doc. No. 1). In summary,				
20	Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have engaged in copyright infringement and unfair competition by copying Plaintiff's products, advertisements and trademarks. <i>Id.</i> Plaintiff asserts that there is good cause for this Court to authorize early discovery in this case to allow Plaintiff to identify the Doe defendants that Plaintiff alleges assisted in the infringing acts of Defendant.				
21					
22					
23					
24	Typically, discovery does not commence against a party until the conference required by				
	Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f) has occurred. Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(d). The Court concurs with Plaintiff that it has				
25	the authority to expedite discovery for good cause. <i>Id.</i> The Court is not convinced that good cause				
26	to expedite discovery is present in this case.				
27	Plaintiff has identified and sued the entity and individuals alleged to be primarily				
28					
			- 1 -		11cv2910 MMA (MDD)

Case 3:11-cv-02910-MMA-MDD Document 5 Filed 01/10/12 PageID.46 Page 2 of 2

responsible for the infringement and unfair competition. The Doe defendants, according to Plaintiff, are believed to have assisted in the infringing activities. The Court does not agree that the need to identify these defendants is of such importance, in consideration of the administration of justice, as to outweigh any prejudice to the responding party. See Semitool, Inc. v. Tokyo Electron America, Inc., 208 F.R.D. 273, 276 (N.D. Cal. 2002). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED: DATED: January 10, 2012 U.S. Magistrate Judge